DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 323 593 EA 022 016

AUTHOR Ogletree, Earl J.; Thomas, Vernadine
TITLE Effect of Leadership Styles of School Administrators on Teacher Evaluation of Their Job Performance.
PUB DATE 12 Jun 90
NOTE 34p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; Administrator Responsibility; Administrator Role; Administrators; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Leadership; Intergroup Relations; Job Performance; *Leadership; Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Styles; *Principals; Private Schools; Public Schools; School Administration; Teacher Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS *Illinois (Chicago)

ABSTRACT

The effect of leadership styles of school administrators on teacher evaluations of their job performances is examined in this paper. A secondary focus is a comparison of teacher characteristics and their effects on administrator evaluation. A principal evaluation survey was administered to 120 Chicago public and nonpublic school teachers, counselors, coordinators, and assistant principals with ratings assigned on the basis of four leadership styles: Laissez Faire, Democratic, Dictatorial, and Transactional. Findings indicate that teacher experience or principals' administrative level had no significant effects on evaluation. Overall, the Transactional and Democratic leadership styles as well as the type of school (private and preschool) had the most positive influence on the evaluation of principals' job performance. The results suggest that principals, particularly those who employ the Laissaz Faire and Dictatorial styles, reexamine their approaches to school management. Five statistical tables and an extensive bibliography are included. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED323593

EFFECT OF LEADERSHIP STYLES OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS ON TEACHER EVALUATION OF THEIR JOB PERFORMANCE

Earl J. Ogletree and Vernadine Thomas

From the dawn of history, the experience of humans had been repleted with the phenomenon commonly referred to as leadership. Our written record of experiences, from the caveman's simple drawing to the latest account of interpersonal relationships, included some designation of group leadership (Wood, 1979). In ancient Greece the philosopher Xenophon attacked Sophists of his day as innovators who were leading youths away from ancient virtues Knezevich (1969). Socrates was judged guilty of corrupting the youth of Athens by discussing purposes, values, and methods not in harmony with those of his contemporaries who were then stressing the immediate-success approach to education Knezevich (1969).

Knickerbocker (1969) describes a leader as that person who has control of the means necessary to satisfy the needs of followers. Bavelas (1969) views the leadership position as means of controlling organizational effectiveness of decision-making. In War and Peace, Tolstoy (1969) spoke of this power as given to the leadership by the will of the people. According to Knickerbocker (1969) leadership and human behavior in organizations are two sides of the same coin. He describes leadership as being "concerned with human energy in organized

EA 028 016

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
E. J. Ogletree
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

groups." He contends that it is a force which initiates action among people. Stogdill (1958) defines leadership "as a process of influencing the activities of an organized group in the task of goal setting and goal achieving." Taylor (1962) concluded that leadership is people, and that we don't know much about leadership because we don't know much about people. On the other hand, Gibb (1968) discussed various theories of leadership and the leader's role in terms of intended influence.

Ginzberg (1966) said "This is a hostile world, and many individuals feel their insecurity acutely" (p. 124). He also states that leaders influence them by making them feel more secure. McGregor (1966) contends that a leader's attitude has a strong effect on follower's performance, and in a school setting the principal's beliefs about the human nature of others can positively or negatively affect staff performance. Kaiser (1985) feels that an equally important effect to consider is the effect of a job on an individual's performance. A principal's knowledge of the interplay between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation factors is necessary if the principal is to provide a leadership role in increasing staff performance.

The earliest attempts to categorize the characteristic manners in which leaders behave while attempting to carry out their responsibilities seem to have been made only after we were well into the twentieth century (Boles and Davenport 1975). The

earliest use of the word "style" to describe a characteristic manner of behavior seems to have been by Weber (1947).

Leadership style has been classified into autocratic, laissez-faire, and democratic. An older compendum of styles is an adaptation of Kurt, Levin, Lippitt and White's (1930's) original "social climates" of authoritarianism, democracy and laissez-faire and subordinate performance. Kaiser (1985) defines autocratic leadership style as characterized by close supervision, task orientation, criticism and punishment for poor performance. A democratic leadership style is characterized by participative, pluralistic-decision making and by subordinate involvement in task once associated with leader-ship functions. Laissez-faire leadership allows high levels of subordinate freedom and is close to complete abdication of leadership responsibility.

In Wood's (1979) version of the three leadership styles, he states that a school with an autocratic principal there is little or no provision for the organization of committees to evaluate the school. He feels that the autocratic leadership works against our society's concept of the importance of the individual. Secondly, he feels that the principal under laissez-faire leadership would provide no guidelines for such established committees. Thirdly, he concludes the democratic leader is not one who sits on his hands every time a decision

must be made, but utilizes his or her own competencies as an educational leader as well as the opinions of the well-informed. Woods also is in agreement with Lippitt and White's (1930) study that the most promising leadership style for effective school principle is the democratic style and that teachers expect to work in an atmosphere of democracy. Early research had characterized three styles of leadership: autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire. For the sake of semantic consistency it appears more appropriate to refer to these three styles as autocratic, democratic, and anarchic Browne (1958). He contends that a variant of these styles is manipulative leadership. For example, the autocratic style of leadership the leader determines policy and assigns tasks to members without consulting with them. The leader decrees what shall be done, and the others have no choice but to accept it. In the democratic style of leadership all policies are derived from group action or decision. Members decide with whom they would like to work. Lastly, the anarchic style of leadership grants complete freedom to group or individual decision without a leader. Tead (1935) seems to have stood almost alone in warning that there are some very real weaknesses in the democratic style. Knezevich (1969) states that teachers find it difficult to accept the democratic style of leadership if most of their professional career has been spent under an autocratic or manipulative style of leadership. However, Bennis and Slater

(1968) made a convincing case that "democracy is inevitable" in all phases of life and in all human societies. On the other hand, Bendix (1942) describes a discipline centered authoritarian administration which is similar to the "punishment-centered" concept-that is one in which the official s obedience is exclusively to his superiors. Because his obligation is to prevailing authority, he develops a feeling of solidarity against the public which he confronts as a representative of higher authority rather than as a public employee.

Several other researchers and theorists seem to have started from the premise that style is a personality characteristic that varies with the situation (Boles and Davenport 1975). Moser (1957) seems to have coined the term "transactional" to describe the style wherein there is recognition that social system goals must be carried out. Knezevich (1969) seems to feel that the transactional leader appreciates the need to achieve institutional goals, but at the same time hopes that individual personalities will not be violated as they strive toward these goals.

A leader should learn to recognize his style and then seek situations in which he can effectively use it, according to Fiedley (1967). Schutz (1977) states that some situations are more difficult for administrators to deal with successfully than others. Kaiser (1985) feels that a teacher's performance may be

contingent on leadership style and the degree to which the leader has control and influence in a particular situation. Hersey and Blanchard (1972) theorize that Argyris's (1964) immaturity-maturity continuum showing an employee's maturation over a period of time can be useful in determining an appropriate leadership style.

Teacher and principal relations can affect performance outcomes. The principal's relations can affect performance outcomes. The principal is not always in control of his relationships with staff (Kaiser 1985). Kaiser and Lietz (1986) report socioeconomic characteristics of faculty as directly correlated with grievance-filing propensity regardless of the leadership style of the principal.

Rochester City School District's principals and other school-based administrators received mixed grades from teachers and other members of the Rochester Teachers Association (NYSUT-AFT 1985). The recent national and state reforms have advocated accountability for teachers as well as administrators for educational excellence and demand for accountability has precipitated the evaluation of teachers. There are few studies on the evaluation of principals by teachers and how an administrator's leadership style influences teachers' perception of their job performance not only are the data needed to improve the quality of the schools, but it would add to the state of knowledge and become the bases for subsequent research.

Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of leadership styles of school administrators on teacher evaluation of their job performance.

Questions Studied

1. What is the effect of leadership style of school administrators on teachers' evaluation of their job performance?
2. Does experience of teachers effect their evaluation of the job performance?
3. Do suburban public school teachers evaluate the job performance of their principals differently than Chicago public school teachers?
4. Does grade level of teachers influence their evaluation of the job performance of their principals?
5. Does position of teachers influence their evaluation of the job performance of their principals?
6. What is the overall teacher evaluation of the job performance of Chicago area principals?

Population and Sample

The population and sample for this study included 120 Chicago and suburban public and non-public teachers' counselors' coordinators and assistant principals. The sample was administered a revised version of the AFT'S "Teachers' Principal Evaluation Survey."

The results were tabulated in terms of percentages and cross/tabulated to determine the influence of the independent variables on the teachers' responses. The chi-square test was be employed.

Results

Overall, the data appear to indicate that teachers rated Transactional administrative style and the highest (94% satisfactory and very good) with Democratic (88% satisfactory and very good) receiving the next highest rating, followed by Laissez-faire and Dictatorial which received lower rating of 38 and 47 percent, respectively.

The responses to the general question on "the effect of administrators styles on teachers evaluation of their job performance" are tabulated in Table I.

TABLE I
LEADERSHIP STYLES AND TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATOR'S OVERALL PERFORMANCE

N=18			N=44			N=23			N=35		
Laissez Faire			Democratic			Dictatorial			Transactional		
Percent			Percent			Percent			Percent		
P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG
56*	33	5	7	36	52*	44	47	0	0	74*	20

*Significant at .05 level

P= Poor S= Satisfactory VG = Very Good

The overall responses of the respondents showed 52 percent of the teachers rated the Democratic style as very good and 36 percent as satisfactory. The Laissez-Faire style received 56 percent poor rating and only 33 percent satisfactory, while the Dictatorial style was voted as satisfactory by only 47 percent and poor by 44 percent of the teachers. The responses to the Transactional style showed a rating of 74% satisfactory and 20 percent very good. The data indicated that the Laissez-Faire and Dictatorial styles were the least acceptable leadership styles, while the Democratic and Transactional were the most preferred style and by the majority (89%) and 94% of the sample, respectively. For the following questions see Table IA. To the question, your principal "genuinely supported faculty/staff in fostering pupil achievement," overall percentages includes 50 percent satisfactory 71 percent very good for Democratic, 44 percent satisfactory and 35% very good for the Dictatorial leadership style while Transactional style received 43 percent satisfactory and 51 percent very good ratings. The two styles rated most highly were the Democratic and Transactional; a close third was Dictatorial. To "Fosters high faculty/staff morale," the Laissez style received a low response of only 11 percent satisfactory and 6 percent very good as compared to the Democratic style of 41 percent satisfactory and 41 percent very good.

An important aspect of school climate administrative-teacher relations is the following responses to "Treats faculty/staff with

TABLE 1A

RESPONSES TO THE EFFECT OF LEADERSHIP STYLE OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS ON TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF THEIR JOB PERFORMANCE

	N=18 LAISSEZ FAIRE			N=44 DEMO			N=23 DICTATORIAL			N=35 TRANS			TOTAL		
	P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG
1. Exercises authority fairly and consistently.	50	44	6	7	41	52*	65*	26	4	8	66*	26	25	46	28
2. Provides instructional leadership.	67*	33	0	14	36	48	44	48	8	29	49*	22	32	42	26
3. Helps maintain an orderly school environment.	44	33	22	7	36	55*	30	52*	17	11	46	40	18	42	38
4. Encourages meaningful faculty/staff involvement in school policy development.	61*	28	11	11	23	64*	52*	39	9	20	49*	31	29	34	37
5. Provides support to faculty/staff in student discipline cases.	39	44*	11	9	25	61*	9	52*	35	17	37	43	16	37	43
6. Maintains high student behavior standards.	50*	33	11	9	34	52*	26	48	26	9	54*	37	18	43	37
7. Genuinely supports faculty/staff in fostering pupil achievement.	33	50*	17	7	18	71*	21	44	35	6	43	51	13	35	50
8. Welcomes, benefits from constructive criticism.	50*	39	6	9	34	50*	65*	30	0	14	66*	14	28	43	23
9. Uses available financial resources to improve instruction.	22	44*	17	5	41	52*	22	39	35	3	40	51	10	41	43
10. Fosters high faculty/staff morale.	78*	11	6	18	41	41	78*	22	0	23	60*	14	40	38	20
11. Treats faculty/staff with dignity and as professionals.	28	61*	11	13	23	64*	52*	39	9	11	46	43	23	38	39
12. Supports faculty/staff against unwarranted attacks and criticism.	17	50*	11	6	34	55*	35	52*	4	9	49	42	14	44	35
13. Secures adequate supplies--paper, chalk, etc.--for staff.	17	39*	27	2	23	73*	22	48	30	3	29	65*	8	32	56
14. Secures adequate number of books and related teaching material for students.	28	44*	11	5	32	55*	17	44	30	6	23	65*	11	33	47
15. Building and classrooms are kept neat and clean.	22	39*	33	7	39	52*	17	57	26	6	49	42	11	45	41
16. Needed building and classroom repairs are completed as soon as possible.	39	39	22	14	39	42	30	35	30	9	45	46	19	40	38
17. Recognizes the achievements of individual faculty/staff members.	44	39	6	11	25	64*	39	39	9	14	46	40	23	36	37
18. Encourages initiative and creativity by the faculty/staff.	50*	28	11	9	18	73*	44	39	4	11	51*	37	23	33	40
19. Supervision and evaluation of faculty/staff are objective and fairly applied.	50*	22	11	18	32	41	52*	35	9	9	54*	34	27	28	27
20. Attempts to reduce classroom interruptions.	44	33	6	11	41	43	35	35	22	9	60*	28	20	44	29
21. Does all possible to lessen paperwork and faculty nonteaching duties.	67*	22	0	14	46	38	52*	30	0	23	57*	17	32	43	19
22. Assigns tasks fairly and equitably.	33	39	11	14	34	45	65*	35	0	14	66*	20	27	44	24
23. Ensures that faculty/staff meetings are meaningful.	44	50	6	9	32	57*	35	52	9	23	46*	31	23	43	33
24. Adheres to negotiated contracts.	11	61*	22	0	27	66*	22	35	34	3	51*	40	7	41	46
25. Using the same code as above, indicate your overall rating of this administrator's performance.	56*	33	5	7	36	52*	44	47	0	0	74*	20	19	49	26

*Statistically significant .05 level

*P= Poor S= Satisfactory VG= Very Good

dignity and as professionals," showed a 61 percent satisfactory rating for Laissez-Faire and 11 percent very good, while the Democratic style received a 23 percent satisfactory rating and a 64 percent very good rating for the Democratic style. The Dictatorial style was rated 39 percent satisfactory and 9 percent very good in the sample. However, the Transactional style received a 46 percent satisfactory and 43 percent very good rating. Democratic and Transactional styles received the highest rating. Similarly, staff had a high morale under the democratic and transactional style. The sample gave "Instructional leadership" under the Laissez Faire leadership style a rating of 67 percent poor and 33 percent satisfactory. Similar low responses were given for the Dictatorial style by the sample to the morale issue. The findings indicate that "Adhere to negotiated contracts" also reflect high percentages of satisfactory to very good for all leadership styles. Sixty-six percent and 40 percent of the Democratic and Transactional styles, respectively received very good rating on adhering to the union contract.

The second general question was concerned with "What effect does the experience of teachers have on their evaluation of the job performance of their principals. See Table II.

TABLE II

EXPERIENCE OF TEACHERS AND EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATOR'S OVERALL PERFORMANCE

N=18 1-5 Years			N=36 6-10 Years			N=65 11 Years		
Percent			Percent			Percent		
P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG
6	56*	28	17	42	36	25	51*	20

*Significant at .05 level
P= Poor S= Satisfactory VG = Very Good

The findings indicated that the majority of teachers with six to ten years of experience rated the job performance of their principals's from satisfactory (42%) to very good (36%). Fifty-one percent of teachers with eleven years experience or more rated their principal job performance as satisfactory while twenty percent gave a very good rating.

See Table IIA for the following data: Relative to the "Exercise of authority fairly and consistently, "Table IIA indicates that 66 percent of teachers with one to five years of experience felt their principal handled authority satisfactorly; 28 percent felt the handling of authority was very good. Teachers with six to ten years of experience rated the handling of authority as 50 percent satisfactory and 31 percent very good. The majority of teachers with eleven years of experience and upward category rated the administrator's performance at 46

TABLE IIA - EXPERIENCE OF TEACHERS

RESPONSES TO THE EXPERIENCE OF TEACHERS EFFECT ON THEIR EVALUATION OF THE JOB PERFORMANCE OF THEIR PRINCIPAL

	N= 18 1-5			N=36 6-10			N=65 11--			Total		
	P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG
1. Exercises authority fairly and consistently.	6	66	28	19	50	31	34	37	28	25	46	28
2. Provides instructional leadership.	17	50	33	28	36	36	37	43	19	32	42	26
3. Helps maintain an orderly school environment.	6	44	44	14	42	41	25	40	35	18	42	38
4. Encourages meaningful faculty/staff involvement in school policy development.	11	44	39	25	22	53	37	37	26	29	34	36
5. Provides support to faculty/staff in student discipline cases.	11	39	39	11	33	50	19	39	42	16	37	43
6. Maintains high student behavior standards.	6	9	44	14	41	39	23	43	34	18	43	37
7. Genuinely supports faculty/staff in fostering pupil achievement.	11	44	39	14	25	61	14	37	48	13	35	50
8. Welcomes, benefits from constructive criticism.	11	17	50	19	53*	25	37	46	15	28	43	23
9. Uses available financial resources to improve instruction.	3	8	36	9	36	53	11	45	39	10	41	43
10. Fosters high faculty/staff morale.	17	50	33	42	36	19	46	37	17	40	38	20
11. Treats faculty/staff with dignity and as professionals.	11	22	67	19	44	36	26	40	34	30	31	39
12. Supports faculty/staff against unwarranted attacks and criticism.	11	44	28	8	44	42	17	45	34	14	44	35
13. Secures adequate supplies--paper, chalk, etc.--for staff.	6	33	57	14	17	64	5	40	52	8	32	56
14. Secures adequate number of books and related teaching material for students.	17	22	50	11	28	44	8	40	48	11	33	47
15. Building and classrooms are kept neat and clean.	6	44	44	6	42	47	15	46	39	11	45	42
16. Needed building and classroom repairs are completed as soon as possible.	11	50*	33	14	39	47	25	37	35	19	40	38
17. Recognizes the achievements of individual faculty/staff members.	6	39	50	21	31	42	26	39	31	23	36	38
18. Encourages initiative and creativity by the faculty/staff.	6	33	56	25	22	47	26	40	31	23	33	40
19. Supervision and evaluation of faculty/staff are objective and fairly applied.	17	22	39	25	36	33	29	43	23	27	38	28
20. Attempts to reduce classroom interruptions.	17	22	44	25	33	33	19	55	23	20	44	29
21. Does all possible to lessen paperwork and faculty nonteaching duties.	11	39	39	36	39	19	35	46	14	32	43	19
22. Assigns tasks fairly and equitably.	11	39	39	36	28	31	25	55*	17	27	44	24
23. Ensures that faculty/staff meetings are meaningful.	11	44	39	22	39	36	26	45	29	23	43	33
24. Adheres to negotiated contracts.	0	33	44	6	47	42	9	39	49	7	41	46

percent, 37 percent satisfactory and 17 percent very good. Relative to the administrator's attitude toward "constructive criticism" teachers with one to five years of experience gave ratings of 17 percent satisfactory and 50 percent very good, respectively. Teachers with six to ten years of experience gave rating os 42 percent poor, 36 percent satisfactory and 19 percent very good. Administrators received ratings of 46 percent poor and 37 percent satisfactory and 17 percent very good from teachers with eleven years of experience and upward. The total responses across all level of experience on "Exercises authority fairly and consistently" showed a 46 percent were satisfied, while 44 percent rated "Supports faculty/staff against unwarranted attacks and criticism" as satisfactory. On the other hand, "Adheres to negotiated contracts" was rated very good by 45 percent by all level of experienced teachers.

The third general question: "Do suburban public school teachers evaluate the job performance of their principals differently than Chicago public school teachers" are tabulated in Table III. As a result of a smaller bureaucracy, suburban public school teachers are probably more critical than their counterparts in the Chicago public school system. In support of the investigator's hypotheses, 21 percent of the teachers in the Chicago public school system rated their administrator's performance as poor, 48 percent satisfactory and 28 percent very good. In contrast, the suburban public school teachers gave

ratings of 39 percent poor, 34 percent satisfactory and 26 percent very good to their principals.

See Table IIIA for the following responses: To the questions regarding recognition of "Individual faculty/staff, members achievements" teachers in the two systems were remarkably similar in their evaluations. Chicago public school principals received a rating of 28 percent poor, 33 percent satisfactory and 36 percent very good, while suburban public school principals were given ratings of 20 percent poor, 33 percent satisfactory and 36 percent very good. In response to the question attempts to "reduce classroom interruption," there is a noticeable significant (.05) difference in responses between two systems. The Chicago public system was rated as 25 percent poor, 38 percent satisfactory and 33 percent very good, whereas the suburban systems received 18 percent poor, 58 percent satisfactory and 18 percent very good evaluations. The findings for "Encourages meaningful faculty/staff involvement in school policy development" indicated that both Chicago public and Chicago non-public schools received high ratings of 66 percent and 64 percent of a combination of satisfactory and very good ratings, respectively. A section of the general question inquiries as to "whether there are any differences between the public school teachers and non-public school teachers in the all over evaluation of their principal's performances," showed a

TABLE III

DO SUBURBAN PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS EVALUATE THE JOB PERFORMANCE OF THEIR PRINCIPALS DIFFERENTLY THAN CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOL OVERALL PERFORMANCE

N=61 Public Chicago			N=40 Public Suburb			N=14 Non-Public Chicago			N=5 Non-Public Suburb		
Percent			Percent			Percent			Percent		
P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG
21	48	28	39	34	26	7	50	29	0	60	40

*Significant at .05 level
P =Poor S =Satisfactory VG =Very Good

significance of 45 percent to 31 percent in the two systems ratings in favor of the non-public schools. For example, (see Table IIIA), "Does all possible to lessen paperwork and faculty/staff," showed a significant (.05) difference, none of the non-public suburban school principals received a poor rating but they were giving ratings of forty percent satisfactory and 60 percent very good. But Chicago non-public school principals received a 36 percent poor rating. To the question, "Ensures that faculty/staff meetings are meaningful," there again is a disparity between the two systems. Teachers in the non-public Chicago system rated their principal job performance as poor (14%) and satisfactory (64%) and very good (21%). The non-public suburban teachers rated their principal's job performance as 20 percent poor and 60 percent very good. It would seem that the differences in response to "Adheres to negotiated contracts"

TABLE IIIA - SCHOOL SYSTEM

RESPONSES TO DO SUBURBAN PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS EVALUATE THE JOB PERFORMANCE OF THEIR PRINCIPALS DIFFERENTLY THAN CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS

	N=61 PUBLIC CHICAGO			N=40 PUBLIC SUBURB			N=14 NON-PUBLIC CHICAGO			N=5 NON-PUBLIC SUBURB			TOTAL		
	P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG
1. Exercises authority fairly and consistently.	30	41	28	27	48	25	7	64	29	0	40	60	25	46	28
2. Provides instructional leadership.	36	36	28	33	43	23	14	64	22	20	40	40	32	42	26
3. Helps maintain an orderly school environment.	23	39	34	13	47	40	21	36	42	0	40	60	18	42	38
4. Encourages meaningful faculty/staff involvement in school policy development.	33	25	41	23	52	25	36	21	43	20	40	40	29	34	36
5. Provides support to faculty/staff in student discipline cases.	10	39	46	28	35	37	7	29	50	20	40	40	16	17	43
6. Maintains high student behavior standards.	23	41	33	17	45	38	7	50	36	0	20	80	18	43	37
7. Genuinely supports faculty/staff in fostering pupil achievement.	13	38	48	20	30	48	0	36	64	0	40	60	13	35	50
8. Welcomes, benefits from constructive criticism.	30	39	25	30	50	20	21	36	29	0	60	20	28	43	23
9. Uses available financial resources to improve instruction.	12	38	46	10	45	35	7	43	50	0	40	60	10	41	43
10. Fosters high faculty/staff morale.	44	34	20	43	37	20	29	43	21	0	80	20	40	39	20
11. Treats faculty/staff with dignity and as professionals.	30	31	39	15	50	36	14	50	35	20	0	80	23	38	39
12. Supports faculty/staff against unwarranted attacks and criticism.	20	43	31	10	50	33	7	36	50	0	40	60	14	14	35
13. Secures adequate supplies--paper, chalk, etc.--for staff.	12	43	44	3	23	65	14	14	71	0	20	80	8	32	56
14. Secures adequate number of books and related teaching material for students.	13	41	41	10	28	50	7	21	50	0	20	80	11	33	47
15. Building and classrooms are kept neat and clean.	16	51	33	8	38	53	0	43	43	0	43	43	11	45	42
16. Needed building and classroom repairs are completed as soon as possible.	23	41	35	18	38	43	7	43	43	20	40	40	19	40	38
17. Recognizes the achievements of individual faculty/staff members.	28	33	36	20	33	38	14	43	29	0	60	40	23	36	38
18. Encourages initiative and creativity by the faculty/staff.	26	33	38	20	38	40	21	21	43	0	40	60	23	33	40
19. Supervision and evaluation of faculty/staff are objective and fairly applied.	31	36	28	25	35	30	21	50	21	0	40	40	27	38	28
20. Attempts to reduce classroom interruptions.	25	38	33	18	58	18	14	50	29	0	0	80	20	44	29
21. Does all possible to lessen paperwork and faculty nonteaching duties.	26	51	15	43	33	18	36	28	36	0	60	40	32	43	19
22. Assigns tasks fairly and equitably.	31	43	23	23	55	15	29	21	43	0	40	60	27	44	24
23. Ensures that faculty/staff meetings are meaningful.	23	39	38	28	45	25	14	64	21	20	0	60	23	43	33
24. Adheres to negotiated contracts.	8	41	46	5	40	50	7	50	36	0	20	40	7	41	46
25. Using the same code as above, indicate your overall rating of this administrator's performance.	21	48	28	39	34	26	7	50	29	0	60	40	19	49	26

of non-public Chicago school teachers and non-public suburban teachers would be negotiable, but the data showed that seven percent of the non-public Chicago teachers rated their principal's job performance as poor, while 50 percent teachers rated their principal's as satisfactory and 36 percent very good. On the other hand, the non-public suburban school teachers did not give their principal a poor rating but a 20 percent overall evaluation of satisfactory and 40 percent very good. There is little or no difference between the Chicago public schools teachers and the suburban public school teachers in their judgment as the commitment of their principals to "Fosters high faculty/morale." Basically, there was only a slight difference on many issues, except for the key issues in which the non-public Chicago and non-public suburban gave higher rating on certain key issues, as indicated above.

The fourth general question dealt with the influence of grade or teaching level of teachers on their evaluation of the job performance of their principals, and depicted in Table IV. The data indicate that there was not an appreciable difference in the rating of principals by the elementary and secondary teachers. For example, seventeen percent of the elementary rated their principal's job performance as poor, while 46 percent rated their principal as satisfactory and 23 percent as very good. The pre-school sample and others may not represent the norm, that is all pre-school teachers gave their principals

a 100 percent satisfactory ratings. The following data are in Table IVA. . In regards to rating of the principal's commitment to "Secures adequate supplies--paper, chalk, etc,--for staff." The elementary teachers rated their principals as nine percent poor, 28 percent satisfactory and 59 percent very good. Secondary teachers rated their administrators as nine percent poor, 34 percent satisfactory and 51 percent very good. Thirty-three percent of Pre-school teachers and their principal was very good on "Exercises authority fairly and consistently." Elementary teachers gave their principals ratings of 23 percent very good. Where as teachers rated their administrators as 29 percent poor, 43 percent satisfactory and 28 percent very good. In contrast, pre-school teachers rated their administrators 100 percent satisfactory. The survey indicated that overall non-public suburb school teachers rated their principals higher than public school teachers.

TABLE IV

GRADE OR TEACHING LEVEL OF TEACHERS ON THEIR EVALUATION OF THE JOB PERFORMANCE OF THEIR PRINCIPALS' OVERALL PERFORMANCE

N=75 ELEM			N=29 SECONDARY			N=3 PRE-SCHOOL			N=5 OTHER		
Percent			Percent			Percent			Percent		
P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG
17	49*	31	20	46*	23	0	100*	0	50*	33	0

*Significant at .05 level
P =Poor S = Satisfactory VG =Very Good

TABLE IVA TEACHING LEVEL

RESPONSES TO THE GRADE LEVEL OF TEACHERS INFLUENCE ON THEIR EVALUATION OF THE JOB PERFORMANCE OF THEIR PRINCIPALS

	N=75 ELEM.			N=35 SECON.			N=3 PRE. SCHOOL			N=5 OTHER			TOTAL	
	P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S
1. Exercises authority fairly and consistently.	23	45	31	29	43	28	0	100	0	50	50	0	25	46
2. Provides instructional leadership.	32	43	25	34	43	23	33	33	0	17	33	50	32	42
3. Helps maintain an orderly school environment.	17	43	37	17	40	43	0	33	67	50	33	17	18	42
4. Encourages meaningful faculty/staff involvement in school policy development.	31	25	43	29	48	23	0	67	33	33	50	17	29	34
5. Provides support to faculty/staff in student discipline cases.	16	37	44	17	37	43	0	0	67	17	50	17	16	37
6. Maintains high student behavior standards.	19	47	32	23	34	40	0	33	67	0	50	50	18	43
7. Genuinely supports faculty/staff in fostering pupil achievement.	15	36	49	14	37	46	0	33	33	0	17	83	13	35
8. Welcomes, benefits from constructive criticism.	28	41	28	29	46	17	0	67	0	33	33	17	28	43
9. Uses available financial resources to improve instruction.	9	39	48	11	46	34	0	33	33	17	50	33	10	41
10. Fosters high faculty/staff morale.	30	35	25	49	34	14	0	100	0	33	67	0	40	38
11. Treats faculty/staff with dignity and as professionals.	20	36	44	31	40	29	0	100	0	17	33	50	23	38
12. Supports faculty/staff against unwarranted attacks and criticism.	17	41	35	9	57	29	0	33	33	17	17	17	14	44
13. Secures adequate supplies--paper, chalk, etc.--for staff.	9	28	59	9	34	5	0	33	67	0	67	33	8	32
14. Secures adequate number of books and related teaching material for students.	11	33	51	11	37	37	33	0	37	33	0	67	11	33
15. Building and classrooms are kept neat and clean.	15	36	48	0	54	40	33	67	0	17	83	0	11	45
16. Needed building and classroom repairs are completed as soon as possible.	19	33	47	14	54	26	67	33	0	33	33	33	19	40
17. Recognizes the achievements of individual faculty/staff members.	23	33	40	23	40	32	0	67	33	33	33	33	23	36
18. Encourages initiative and creativity by the faculty/staff.	25	29	41	17	40	37	0	67	33	33	17	50	23	33
19. Supervision and evaluation of faculty/staff are objective and fairly applied.	29	40	27	23	37	31	0	0	0	33	33	33	27	38
20. Attempts to reduce classroom interruptions.	21	44	32	20	43	29	0	67	32	17	33	0	20	44
21. Does all possible to lessen paperwork and faculty nonteaching duties.	32	44	23	37	37	11	0	33	67	17	50	0	32	43
22. Assigns tasks fairly and equitably.	32	39	28	14	54	20	0	67	0	50	50	0	27	44
23. Ensures that faculty/staff meetings are meaningful.	20	45	33	29	43	26	33	33	33	33	37	50	23	43
24. Adheres to negotiated contracts.	7	45	43	6	34	57	0	33	33	17	33	17	7	41
25. Using the same code as above, indicate your overall rating of this administrator's performance.	17	49	31	20	46	23	0	100	0	50	33	0	19	49

Response to the fifth general question: "Does the position teachers influence the evaluation of the job performance on their principals," are in Table V. A section of the general question that dealt with overall teacher evaluation of the job performance of their principals overall performance survey, as shown in Table V depicted ratings of 27 percent very good, 52 percent as satisfactory and 17 percent poor from teachers, where as the assistant principals gave ratings of 44 percent satisfactory 11 percent poor and 33 percent very good. The counselors ratings were very similar to the teachers. On the other hand, the coordinators responded to the question with a 56 percent very poor, 22 percent satisfactory and 11 percent very good. However, the samples are very small for the latter three groups. The following data are tabulated in Table VA.

In response to "Recognition of the achievement of individual faculty/members" teachers gave ratings of 25 percent poor, 31 percent satisfactory and 33 percent very good to their principal. As expected, assistant principals gave higher evaluations of 56 percent satisfactory and 44 percent very good responses, which coordinators gave evaluations of 22 percent poor, 50 percent satisfactory and 11 percent very good. Also, the findings showed that the question "Assigns tasks fairly and equitable," 60 percent of non-public suburban rated their supervisors as very good as compared to 15 percent of non-public for suburban teachers.

TABLE V

POSITION OF TEACHERS INFLUENCE THE EVALUATION OF THE JOB PERFORMANCE OF THEIR PRINCIPALS' OVERALL PERFORMANCE

N=90 TEACHER PERCENT			N=6 COUNSELOR PERCENT			N=9 ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL PERCENT			N=9 COORDINATOR PERCENT		
P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG
17	52*	27	17	50*	17	11	44	33	56*	22	11

*Significant at .05 level
P =Poor S =Satisfactory VG = Very Good

Summary

The data appear to indicate that teachers gave the Transactional administrative style the highest rating (94% satisfactory and very good with Democratic (88% satisfactory and very good) were the next highest rating followed by Laissez-Faire and Dictatorial which received poor rating (56% and 44%, respectively).

There appeared to be little differences in the rating of principals by teachers with different years of experience, except those with more than six years of experience gave higher ratings. In general, a higher percentage of private school teachers viewed their principals more as satisfactory and very good as compared to public school teachers (.05 level). Only seven percent of the former gave their administrators a poor

TABLE VA POSITION

RESPONSE TO THE POSITION OF TEACHERS INFLUENCE OF THEIR EVALUATION OF THE JOB PERFORMANCE OF THEIR PRINCIPALS

	N=90 TEACHER			N=6 COUNSELOR			N=9 ASSISTANT			N=9 COORD.			TOTAL		
	P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG	P	S	VG
1. Exercises authority fairly and consistently.	21	49	29	17	66	17	22	22	56	78	22	0	25	46	28
2. Provides instructional leadership.	35	41	23	17	67	16	11	33	56	22	44	33	32	32	26
3. Helps maintain an orderly school environment.	19	40	40	17	35	50	0	67	33	33	44	22	18	42	38
4. Encourages meaningful faculty/staff involvement in school policy development.	25	34	40	50	33	17	22	44	33	67	22	11	29	34	36
5. Provides support to faculty/staff in student discipline cases.	18	34	44	0	33	67	0	56	44	22	44	22	16	37	43
6. Maintains high student behavior standards.	21	41	35	0	50	50	0	56	44	22	44	33	18	43	37
7. Genuinely supports faculty/staff in fostering pupil achievement.	14	38	47	0	17	83	11	22	67	22	33	44	13	35	50
8. Welcomes, benefits from constructive criticism.	27	41	26	33	33	33	22	67	11	11	33	56	28	43	23
9. Uses available financial resources to improve instruction.	6	42	45	17	50	33	11	32	57	44	44	11	40	38	20
10. Fosters high faculty/staff morale.	39	38	22	50	33	17	22	56	22	67	33	0	13	7	0
11. Treats faculty/staff with dignity and as professionals.	23	35	42	0	67	33	22	33	44	33	56	11	23	38	39
12. Supports faculty/staff against unwarranted attacks and criticism.	15	44	33	0	50	50	11	56	33	22	33	44	14	44	35
13. Secures adequate supplies--paper, chalk, etc.--for staff.	8	28	59	0	33	67	0	33	56	22	67	11	8	32	56
14. Secures adequate number of books and related teaching material for students.	12	33	47	0	17	67	0	22	67	22	56	11	11	33	47
15. Building and classrooms are kept neat and clean.	9	45	44	0	50	50	0	56	33	44	33	22	11	45	42
16. Needed building and classroom repairs are completed as soon as possible.	22	40	38	0	33	67	0	56	33	22	33	33	19	40	39
17. Recognizes the achievements of individual faculty/staff members.	25	31	40	17	50	33	0	56	44	22	56	11	23	36	38
18. Encourages initiative and creativity by the faculty/staff.	21	35	41	33	0	67	11	67	22	44	0	33	23	33	40
19. Supervision and evaluation of faculty/staff are objective and fairly applied.	25	38	28	17	67	17	11	33	57	67	22	11	27	38	28
20. Attempts to reduce classroom interruptions.	20	45	29	0	83	10	0	33	67	56	22	11	20	44	29
21. Does all possible to lessen paperwork and faculty nonteaching duties.	33	40	21	33	50	17	11	67	22	33	44	0	32	44	0
22. Assigns tasks fairly and equitably.	23	46	25	33	50	17	11	44	44	78	22	0	27	44	24
23. Ensures that faculty/staff meetings are meaningful.	24	43	31	17	50	33	22	22	56	22	56	22	23	43	33
24. Adheres to negotiated contracts.	6	41	46	0	33	50	0	33	67	22	56	22	7	41	46
25. Using the same code as above, indicate your overall rating of this administrator's performance.	17	52	27	17	50	17	11	44	33	56	22	11	19	49	26

rating. Suprisingly, Chicago public teachers rated their principals higher (76% satisfactory and very good) in contrast to the ratings (60%, satisfactory and very good) given to suburban school principals. There appeared to be no significant difference between the evaluations received by elementary and secondary school principals. However, pre-school teachers gave their directors or principals a 100% satisfactory to very good rating. The relatively small size of the sample may have influenced the findings. Also, the data suggest that although assistant principals rated their principal slightly higher than teachers and counselors, the difference was not statistically significant. Overall, the findings appear to indicate that administrative style revealed that Laissez-Faire and Dictatorial principals received the lowest ratings. The majority of the sample gave their Laissez-Faire Principal a poor rating on: 1) instructional leadership, 2) acceptance of constructive criticism, 3) student behavior standards, 4) staff involvement 5) staff morale, 6) fosters initiative and creativity by staff, and 7) fairness in faculty evaluation, 8) reduction of non-teaching choices, and 9) fair execution of authority.

Dictatorial principals received a majority of similar low ratings in most of the above areas. In addition, they failed to assign tasks with dignity and professionally. On the other hand, Dictatorial style principals appeared to maintain higher levels of student behavior standards than the Laissez

principals. An analysis of the data in regards to experience of teachers reveal that teachers with six to ten and eleven and above gave their principals similar ratings. The majority of teachers with six to ten years experience gave their principals poor ratings in: 1) instructional leadership, 2) staff involvement, 3) high faculty/staff morale, 4) achievements of individual faculty/staff members, 5) encourages creativity by faculty/ staff, 6) reduce classroom interruptions, 7) lessen paperwork and faculty non-teaching duties and 8) assigns tasks fairly and equitable. Most of the teachers with eleven years and above experience gave their principal a poor rating on: 1) exercises authority fairly and consistently, 2) instructional leadership, 3) faculty/staff involvement in school policy development, 4) benefits from constructive criticism, 5) fosters high faculty/staff morale, 6) faculty/staff with dignity and as professionals, 7) recognizes achievements of individual faculty/staff members, 8) lessen paperwork and faculty non-teaching duties, 9) assigns tasks fairly equitably and 10) faculty/staff meetings are meaningful. Teachers with experience of 11 years or more evaluated more favorably than the teachers with less than 11 years.

An analysis of the data in responded to the responses of Chicago and suburban public schools and the non-public suburban and Chicago schools, the Chicago public and the suburban public school principals received a poor rating on: 1) exercises

authority fairly and consistently, 2) provides instructional leadership, 3) benefits from constructive criticism, 4) fosters high faculty/staff morale, 5) treats faculty/staff with dignity and as professionals, 6) building and classrooms repairs, 7) recognizes the achievements of individual faculty/staff members, 8) encourages initiative and creativity by the faculty/staff and 9) assigns tasks fairly and equitably. On the other hand, non-public Chicago and non-public suburban school teachers' ratings of their principals were higher than their public school counterpart. The former did not receive low ratings. A comparison of elementary and secondary principal ratings, both received a majority of similar low ratings on: 1) exercises authority fairly and consistently, 2) provides instructional leadership, 3) benefits from constructive criticism, 4) fosters high faculty/staff morale and 5) achievements of individual faculty/staff members. Suprisingly coordinators gave their principals a low poor rating in the following areas:
1) exercises authority fairly and consistently, 2) faculty/staff involvement in school policy development, 3) fosters high faculty/staff morale, 4) uses available financial resources to improve instruction, 5) treats faculty/staff with dignity and as professionals, 6) building and classrooms are kept neat and clean, 7) encourages initiative and creativity by the faculty/staff and 8) supervision and evaluation of faculty/staff are objective and fairly applied. The teachers and assistant

principals rated their principals low on: 1) exercises authority fairly and consistently, 2) encourages meaningful faculty/staff involvement in school policy development, 3) welcomes, benefits from constructive criticism, and 4) treats faculty/staff with dignity and as professionals. In addition, the teacher, along with the counselor gave the principals a very low rating in "Fosters high faculty/staff morale."

Overall, administrative style (transactional and democratic) and type of school (private and preschool) appeared to have the greatest positive influence on evaluation of principal's job performance.

The findings suggest that principals should examine and analyze their mode of administration and supervision. Laissez-Faire and Dictatorial principals need to reflect on and attempt to revise their approach to school management.

Bibliography

BOOKS

Agris, Chris. (1964). Integrating the individual and the organization. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Bavelas, A. (1969). Leadership: Man function in leadership. Selected Readings, ed. C. A. Gibb. New York: Penguin.

Bennis, W. G. and Slater, P. T. (1968). The temporary society. New York: Harper and Row.

Blumberg, A. (1980). Supervisions and teachers: A private cold war. California: Mc Cutchan.

Blumberg. A., and Greenfield, W. (1980). Perspectives on school leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Boles, Harold W., and Davenport, James A. (1975). Introduction to educational Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.

Bolton, Dale L. (1973). Selection and evaluation of teachers. California: Mc Cutchan Publishing Corporation.

Fiedler, F. E. (1969). Leadership a new model. In C.A. Gibb Leadership. Maryland: Penguin.

Gibb, C. A. (1968). Leadership: Psychological aspects. In D. L. Sills International encyclopedia of the social sciences. New York: Macmillan.

Gibb, C. A. (1968). Leadership: Psychological aspects. In D. L. Sills International encyclopedia of the social sciences. New York: Macmillan.

Gibb, C. A. (1969). The handbook of social psychology. Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Ginzberg, E. (1966). "Leader and leadership." The development of human resources. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gross, N. and Herriott, R. E. (1976). Staff leadership in public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. New York: Wiley.

Guba, E. and Bidwell, C. (1957). Administrative Relationships. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago.

Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K. H. (1969). "Life cycle theory of leadership." Training and Development Journal, New Jersey: Prentice; Hall.

Kaiser, Jeffrey S. (1985). The principalship. Illinois: Burgess.

Knezevich, Stephen J. (1975). Administration of public education. New York: Harper and Row.

Knickerbocker, I. (1969). Leadership: A conception and some implications in leadership. New York: Penguin.

Lippitt, R. and White, R. (1947). An experimental study of leadership and group life in T. M. Newcomb and E. L. Hartley. Reading and social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

McGregor, Douglas. (1966). Leadership and motivation. Cambridge, Mass: M I T Press.

Mintzberg, Henry. (1973). The nature of managerial. New York: Harper and Row.

Moser, R. F. (1957). The leadership patterns of school superientendents and school principals. New York: Administrators Notebook.

Redfern, George B. (1980). Evaluating teachers and administrators: A performance objective approach. Colorado: Westview Press.

Schutz, W. FIRO. (1958). New York: Holt, Rinehart.

Sherif, M. (1967). Social interaction. Chicago: Aldine.

Weber, Max. (Ed.). (1947). The theory of social and economic organization, Illinois: Free Press and Falcon's Wins Press

Stogdill, R.,M. (1958). "Leadership, membership and organization," The study of leadership. Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers.

Taylor, J. W. (1962). How to select and develop leaders. New York: Mc Graw Hill.

Tead, O. (1935). The art of leadership. New York: Mc-Graw Hill.

Tolstoy, Leo. (1969). War and peace. New York: Mc-Graw Hill.

Wood, Charles L. (1979) The secondary school principal manager and supervisory. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

PERIODICALS

Abbey, D. E. and Eposito, James P. (1985). "Social support and principal leadership style: A means to reduce teacher stress." Education, 105, 327.

Bauser, Robert L. and Banks, Freddie A. (1984). "The way, what, how and by whom of evaluation principals, "NASSP Bulletin, 1, 68.

Bullock, William Jr., Davis, Joseph. (1985). "Interpersonal factors that influence principals' rating of teacher performance." Planning and Changing, 16, 3-11.

Carter, L. (1950). "The behavior of leaders and other members." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 65.

Friedlander, F.F. (1973). "Emergent and Contemporary Life styles: and intergenerational issue." Human Relations, 38, 329-347.

Golightly, C. (1972). "Like and Loaning," Journal of Applied Psychology, 56, 521-523.

Gaslin, William L. (1974). "Evaluation of administrative performance by a school teaching staff," NASSP Bulletin, 58, 72-73.

Getzels, J. & Guba, E. (1957). "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review, 34, p. 423-444.

Grobman, C. G. & Hines, V. A. (1956). "What makes a good principal?" NASSP Bulletin, 40, 5-16.

Jones, Allen P. & James, Lawrence R. (1974). "Organizational climate: A review of theory and research." Psychological Bulletin, 81, 1096-1112.

Kelman, H. C. (1970). "A social-psychological model of political legitimacy and its relevance to white and

black student protest movements." Journal of Applied Psychology, 33, 224-246.

Kunz, Daniel W. & Hoy, Wayne K. (1976). "Leadership style of principals and professional zone of acceptance of teachers." Educational Administration Quarterly, 12, 49-64.

Kauchak, D., Peterson, & Driscoll. (1985). "An interview study of teachers attitudes toward teacher evaluation practices." Journal of Research and Development in Education, 19, 32-37.

Rothberg, R. & Buchanan, L. (1981). "Teacher perceptions of teacher assessment." Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 67.

Stiegelbauer, Suzanne M. (1984). "How principals facilitate change in the schools." Education Digest, 50, 1-2,6.

REPORTS

Educational Research Service. Evaluating administrative performance. Arlington, Virginia. Educational Research Service, 1974 and 1975.

ERIC DOCUMENTS

Osmond, P. "Teacher assessment of supervisory evaluations." Detroit: Wayne State University (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED200514).

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

"Teachers grade their bosses, offer suggestion" Times-Union The City, 26 September 1985.

"The evaluation of administrators." Rochester Teacher Association News Release, 25 September 1985.

"Where we stand." "New York State United Teachers, and American Federation of Teachers, 21 April 1985.

END

U.S. Dept. of Education

Office of Education
Research and
Improvement (OERI)

ERIC

Date Filmed

March 21,1991